



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,035	01/19/2001	Ossi Kalevo	460-010108-US(PAR)	7931
7590 Clarence A. Green PERMAN & GREEN, LLP 425 Post Road Fairfield, CT 06430		EXAMINER LEE, Y YOUNG		
		ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER	
		MAIL DATE 09/08/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/766,035	KALEVO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Y. Lee	2621		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,6-9,11,13-15,19,20,24-27,29,32,33,37-43,54-73 and 84 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,6-9,11,13-15,19,20,24-27,29,32,33,37-43,54-73 and 84 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 September 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings were received on 9/13/04. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 13-15, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 32, 33, 37-43, 54-73, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalevo et al (WO 98/41025) in view of applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA).

Kalevo et al, in Figures 2-5, discloses substantially the same method as specified in claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 13-15, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 32, 33, 37-43, 54-73, and 84 of the present invention, comprising performing an adaptive block boundary filtering operation on a block boundary 30 formed between a first decoded image block on a first side (e.g. left) of the block boundary 30 and a second decoded image block on a second side (e.g. right) of the block boundary 30, the first decoded image block having been encoded using a first type of prediction encoding method and the second decoded image block having been encoded using a second type of prediction encoding method (e.g. Figs. 4-5), wherein at least one parameter of the filtering operation is determined based on the types of the first and second prediction encoding methods 17.

With respect to claims 6-9, 11, 13-15 and their respective corresponding claims, Figures 2-5 of Kalevo et al clearly anticipates the claims by disclosing the same filtering technique for the same reasons as set forth in the previous office actions.

Although Kalevo et al discloses the first and second type of prediction encoding method is selected from a group of prediction encoding methods, it is noted Kalevo et al differs from the present invention in that it fails to particularly disclose at least 4 different methods as specified in claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 13-15, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 32, 33, 37-43, 54-73, and 84. AAPA, however, teaches the concept of such well known system for dividing the block regions into intra coding, copy coding, motion-compensated prediction coding, and not-coded coding.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, having both the references of Kalevo et al and AAPA before him/her, to

exploit the well known block coding method as taught by AAPA in the filtering method of Kalevo et al in order to conform with standardized transmission recommendations.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 13-15, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 32, 33, 37-43, 54-73, and 84 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Y. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7334. The examiner can normally be reached on (571) 272-7334.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Young Lee/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621

yl